

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Jeffrey A. Olson, Plaintiff, v. Hennepin County, Defendant.	Case No. 21-cv-2661 (SRN/DTS) ORDER
---	---

Jeffrey A. Olson, 380 West Bert Street, P.O. Box 536, Lake Crystal, MN 56055, Pro Se

Karuq Karim and James W. Keeler, Jr. Hennepin County Attorney's Office, 300 South Sixth Street, Suites A2000 & C2000, Minneapolis, MN 55487, for Defendant

SUSAN RICHARD NELSON, United States District Judge

Before the Court are two Motions for Rehearing [Doc. Nos. 34 & 38] and a letter that the Court construes as a Motion Requesting Permission to Seek Reconsideration [Doc. No. 39], all filed by Plaintiff Jeffrey A. Olson. Hennepin County objects to Olson's requests for rehearing and reconsideration. (July 1, 2020 Letter [Doc. No. 36].)

On June 14, 2022, the Court granted Defendant Hennepin County's Motion to Dismiss and denied Olson's Motion for Summary Judgment. (June 14, 2022 Order [Doc. No. 32].)

Local Rule 7.1(j) of this Court requires a party seeking reconsideration to first obtain permission to file such a motion. D. Minn. L.R. 7.1(j). A party may receive permission

only by showing “compelling circumstances.” *Id.* Motions for reconsideration serve the limited purpose of “correct[ing] manifest errors of law or fact or . . . present[ing] newly discovered evidence.” *Hagerman v. Yukon Energy Corp.*, 839 F.2d 407, 414 (8th Cir. 1988) (quoting *Rothwell Cotton Co. v. Rosenthal & Co.*, 827 F.2d 246, 251 (7th Cir. 1987)).

Through the instant motion, Mr. Olson essentially seeks to amend his complaint, stating that he would like to “allow[] Form 95 to be entered into [the] record,” and to “bring suit against additional parties, adding Defendants the state of Minnesota and the United States.” (Doc. No. 38 at 1; *see also* Doc. No. 34 at 1; Doc. No. 39 at 1.)

The Court finds that Mr. Olson has not established “compelling circumstances” necessary to obtain leave to file a motion for reconsideration. In addition, his proposed amendments would not cure the defects that led to the dismissal of this action.

Based on the submissions and the entire file and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that

1. Plaintiff’s Motions for Rehearing [Doc. Nos. 34 & 38] are **DENIED**; and
2. Plaintiff’s Letter Request for Permission to Seek Reconsideration [Doc. No. 39] is **DENIED**.

Dated: July 13, 2022

s/Susan Richard Nelson
SUSAN RICHARD NELSON
United States District Judge